

*peruviana* refers to birds from Junín, a new name must be proposed for the aberrant populations found further north:

***Fulica ardesiaca atrura* subsp. nov.**

*Diagnosis.* Differs from the nominate subspecies as the undertail covert feathers are not purely white, but have black inner webs and more or less extensive black streaking and freckling also on the outer webs; in some individuals, in fact, the undertail coverts are nearly completely black.

*Distribution.* In paramos and some lowland swamps from Nariño in southern Colombia through Ecuador and coastal Peru south to Lima. As Andean Coots from paramos in northern Peru were not represented in the present data, their racial attachment remains unknown.

*Type specimen.* Zool. Mus. Univ. Copenhagen 37.891, Ecuador, 7 October 1909.

*Material examined.* 77 ad. Andean Coots, including 25 of this taxon.

*Acknowledgements:* My travels were supported by grants Nos. 511-8136 and 11-2250 of the Danish Natural Science Research Council and by Queen Margrethe's and Prince Henrik's Foundation, Frank M. Chapman Foundation, G.E.C. Gads Foundation and Knud Højgaards Foundation.

References:

- Crawford, R. D. 1978. Tarsal color of American coots in relation to age. *Wilson Bull.* 90: 536-543.
- Fjeldså, J. 1982. Biology and systematic relations of the Andean coot "*Fulica americana ardesiaca*" (Aves, Rallidae). *Steenstrupia* 8: 1-21.
- Fjeldså, J. 1983. Systematic and biological notes on the Colombian Coot *Fulica americana columbiana* (Aves, Rallidae). *Steenstrupia*, in press.
- Gill, F. B. 1964. The shield colour and relationships of certain Andean Coots. *Condor* 66: 209-211.
- Hurtubia, J. 1973. Trophic diversity measurement in sympatric predatory species. *Ecology* 54: 885-890.
- Morrison, A. 1939. A new coot from Peru. *Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl.* 59: 56-57.
- Ripley, S. D. 1977. *Rails of the World*. David R. Godine: Boston.

*Address:* Dr. Jon Fjeldså, Zoologisk Museum, Universitetsparken 15, DK 2100 København, Denmark.

©British Ornithologists' Club 1983.

## A new species of Thicket Warbler *Cichlornis* (Sylviinae) from Bougainville Island, North Solomons Province, Papua New Guinea

by Don Hadden

Received 13 July 1982

The little known and elusive genus of thicket-warblers, *Cichlornis*, was first described by Mayr (1933) from a specimen taken in 1926 by R. H. Beck, who collected one bird from mountain forest (2500 ft) on Espiritu Santo in Vanuatu. Mayr named this unique specimen *C. whitneyi*. Another male and 3 females were also taken from Espiritu Santo between 1933 and 1935 by A. J. Marshall and T. Harrison (Cain & Galbraith 1955). A new subspecies, *C. w. turipavae*, was also described by Cain & Galbraith in the same paper from a single specimen taken by native hunters from Turipava (4100 ft) on Guadalcanal. Two other *Cichlornis* specimens were collected in December

1958 at 5200 ft in the Whiteman Mountains, central New Britain by E. T. Gilliard (1960). These proved to be of a distinct species and were named *Cichlornis grosvenori*.

My discovery of the Bougainville population of *Cichlornis* came about because I was trying to track down a rumour of nesting shearwaters. During my years (1976–1980) on Bougainville I had constantly asked local villagers if they knew the whereabouts of the nesting sites of birds that had webbed feet and lived in holes in the ground in high mountains. Eventually, I was informed by Tony Anung from a village behind Arawa, that he had found the nest of a bird in a hole in a bank near the top of the Crown Prince Range. Accordingly I arranged to spend a long weekend camping at that site to check on this nest and to search for additional shearwater sites. After about 7 hours walking we had progressed from sea level to 5000 ft and were at the nest site. The nest was not that of a shearwater, but obviously of a passerine of some sort. We camped over a ridge close to the nest site and while my guides spent the following day in the forest searching for shearwater nests, I erected mist nets on the ridge above camp. It was in one of these nets that a *Cichlornis* sp. was taken. By the time we had struck camp and returned to Arawa the *Cichlornis* had started to decompose slightly, but the skin was saved and is now lodged in the American Museum of Natural History (AMNH). It proved to be a new species.

#### *Cichlornis llaneae* sp. nov.

*Holotype*: AMNH No. 824713, sex ?, apparently adult, from Crown Prince Range 5000 ft (1550 m), central Bougainville Island, North Solomons Province, Papua New Guinea, approximately 6°19'S, 155°30'E; collected by Don Hadden, 17 June 1979.

*Distribution*: Known only from the type locality.

*Description of holotype*: Head, wings, back and rump sooty olive; feathers of rump not especially elongated or fluffy. Supra-orbital line rich cinnamon-rufous and a distinct black area before, behind and beneath the eye forming a small mask. The lesser wing coverts black, tipped with brownish olive, giving a scalloped appearance. Throat and upper breast cinnamon-rufous. Lower breast and abdomen cinnamon-rufous, shading into dull brown. Flanks and lower abdomen dull brown. The rectrices were in sheath, but black and acuminate, not spine-tipped. The shafts were not stiffened. Legs and bill dark.

I have much pleasure in naming this new thicket warbler for my wife Llane Hadden.

*Measurements of type*: Wing 73.5 mm, tail in sheath, bill from base 21.0 mm, tarsus 26.0 mm.

*Additional remarks*: Comparison of *C. llaneae* with types of *C. grosvenori*, *C. w. whitneyi* and *C. w. turipavae* give the following distinct differences:-

Throat and upper breast of *C. llaneae* cinnamon-rufous, whereas the other 3 populations are tawny buff, *C. w. whitneyi* being the lightest of the three. Lower breast and abdomen of *C. llaneae* cinnamon shading into dull brown, whereas the other 2 species are lighter tawny buff, except that in *C. grosvenori* there is a lighter central area with some feathers mottled buff and brown. The head and back of the other 2 species are brownish olive, whereas they are

TABLE 1  
Measurements of known specimens of *Cicblornis*

		Sex	Wing	Tail	Bill from base	Tarsus
<i>C. w. whitneyi</i> (Type)	(1)	♂	72.0	70.0 +	21.0	28.0
	(1)	♂	68.5	65.0	20.0	27.0
	(2)	♀	63.0	57.0	20.0	25.5
	(2)	♀	60.0	56.5 +	19.5	26.0
	(2)	♀	64.5	68.0	18.5	25.0
<i>C. w. turipavae</i> (Type)	(2)	♂	65.5	76.5	—	27.5
<i>C. grosvenori</i> (Type)	(3)	♀	72.0	59.0	20.0	31.0
	(3)	♂	71.0	65.0	19.5	31.0
<i>C. llanae</i> (Type)		♀	73.5	—	21.0	26.0
		?				

(1) Measurements from Mayr, 1933, p. 4

(2) Measurements from Cain & Galbraith, 1955, p. 91

(3) Measurements from Gilliard, 1960, p. 3

sooty olive in *C. llanae*. The supraorbital line is rich cinnamon-rufous in *C. llanae*, but the other two species have tawny buff lines. The black mask of *C. llanae* is midway in size between the small mask of *C. whitneyi* and the large mask of *C. grosvenori*. The lesser wing coverts on *C. llanae* are markedly scalloped, whereas there is only slight scalloping on *C. w. whitneyi* and none at all on *C. w. turipavae* or *C. grosvenori*. The most striking difference is that the rectrices of *C. llanae* are not disintegrated at the tips nor the shafts stiffened as in the other 2 species. In addition the tail of *C. llanae* is black, not brown as in the other 2 species. The fact that the tail feathers of the type of *C. llanae* are in sheath precludes further comparison, but there is no indication that this specimen is immature. It seems more likely that the simultaneous regrowth of the rectrices is due to the bird having suffered an accident.

The wing of *C. llanae* is much more rounded than the wings of *C. whitneyi* and *C. grosvenori*. The outermost primary (No. 1) is not much shorter than No. 2. Primaries 2, 3, and 4 are equal to or slightly longer than No. 5. In *C. whitneyi* and *C. grosvenori*, primary No. 1 is much shorter than No. 2, and No. 2 is significantly shorter than No. 3, while Nos. 3 and 4 are usually slightly longer than No. 5. The tarsus is shorter and the legs and feet appear weaker in *C. llanae*.

In some respects the new bird is intermediate between *Cicblornis* and *Ortygocichla* (including *Trichocichla*). A case might be made for describing the Bougainville form as a new genus but very little information is available on these genera, and *C. llanae* is definitely closest to *Cicblornis*. R. Orenstein suggests (*in litt.*) that these 2 genera should be included in a larger genus, *Megalurulus*, to include *M. mariae* of New Caledonia, *Trichocichla rufa* of Fiji and *Buettikoferella bivittata* of Timor. However with so little information available, it seems preferable at present not to speculate further on generic limits. Obviously a complete revision is much needed.

*Description of nest and egg:* The passerine nest mentioned above had been placed in a niche in a vertical wall of a creek. About 1 m downstream from the nest the creek disappeared underground and so the nest site was surrounded by walls on three sides. It was about 2 m above the bed of the creek, and the width between the creek walls was 2–3 m. Very little water was trickling down, the weather having been fairly dry the previous week. The nest was made of dark vegetation with a lining of lighter, finer fibres contrasting with the dark outer parts of the nest. A lip of dark vegetation

hung down the wall from the nest, which contained 1 egg 25 x 18 mm and was obviously deserted. The oval egg was a light cream colour and was entirely covered with small brown spots, more heavily at the thicker end where they formed a brownish cap. The egg and nest are in the AMNH.

This nest and egg, found in June 1979, turned out to be those of *Cicblornis llaneae*, but this was not known until one year later when I again camped in the area in June and an identical nest was found in the very same niche as the one I had first seen. For further information on this nest and 2 other specimens of *C. llaneae* and photographs of the type and the nest, see Hadden (1981).

*Acknowledgements:* My wife Llane Hadden has spent many days alone while I have pursued my interests in photography and ornithology. It is as a token of gratitude for her support and interest that I have named this new species for her. I am also grateful to Elliot Harding, Francis Munau and Tony Anung and other village men without whose help I would not have found the thicket-warbler area. Considerable help has also been given by Jared Diamond and R. Orenstein, and in particular I am much indebted to Mary LeCroy and Ian Galbraith who gave invaluable assistance with comparison of specimens from the AMNH and BMNH respectively, as well as their time and expertise, especially that of Mary LeCroy in helping to draft this note.

References:

- Mayr, E. 1933. Birds collected during the Whitney South Sea Expedition. XXII. Three new genera from Polynesia and Melanesia. *Amer. Mus. Novit.* 590: 1-6.  
 Cain, A. J. & Galbraith, I. C. J. 1955. Five new subspecies from the mountains of Guadalcanal (British Solomon Islands). *Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl.* 75: 90-93.  
 Gilliard, E. T. 1960. Results of the 1958-1959 Gilliard New Britain Expedition, 2. A new species of thicket warbler (Aves, *Cicblornis*) from New Britain. *Amer. Mus. Novit.* 2008: 1-6.  
 Hadden, Don. 1981. *Birds of the North Solomons*. Wau Ecology Institute Handbook No. 8. Wau, Papua New Guinea. 107 pp.

*Address:* Don Hadden, 288 Yaldhurst Road, Christchurch, New Zealand.

©British Ornithologists' Club 1983.

## The relationship of male Lesser Honeyguides *Indicator minor* with duetting barbet pairs

by Lester L. Short and Jennifer F. M. Horne

Received 28 June 1982

Our field studies of barbets (Capitonidae) in East Africa have been disrupted regularly by honeyguides (Indicatoridae) interacting with the barbets, and with each other. We particularly elicit approaches by honeyguides when we use our tape-recorder to play back barbet duets, the approaches being to us or to the barbets, which are also stimulated by our playback activities. We reported (Short & Horne 1979) on these responses by *Indicator variegatus*, *I. minor* and probably *I. narokensis* to various barbet species and to playback of the barbets' voices. In that report we posed several questions relating to the honeyguide-barbet interactions. Further data now available allow us to narrow the quest for reasons underlying these honeyguide-barbet interactions.

If we assume that, generally, the honeyguides coming to barbet vocal activities are females seeking a nest in which to lay an egg, since honeyguides